



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,827	01/03/2002	Dean A. Seifert	FDC 0167 PUS	6573
Griff Griffin Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP 999 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 2300 Atlanta, GA 30309-3996				
EXAMINER				
BORLINGHAUS, JASON M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3693				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/27/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/037,827

Applicant(s)

SEIFERT ET AL.

Examiner

JASON M. BORLINGHAUS

Art Unit

3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/18/08 & 2/19/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/18/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2 – 4, 10, 11 – 13, 20, 23 – 27, 29, 33 – 34, 36 and 38 are

provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4, 10, 12 – 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 30, 40 and 54 of copending Application No. 09/975,171 (US PG Pub. 2003/0069856), herein referred to as PG Pub. '856.

Regarding Claims 1, 10 and 20, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims:

- storing transaction data on a host computer system, wherein the transaction data includes a desired amount of money to be electronically transferred from a sender to a recipient. (see Claim 17 of PG Pub. '856);
- receiving transaction identifying information provided by the recipient/receiving at the host computer system transaction identifying

information from a receive-transaction initiating terminal in communication with the host computer system, wherein the transaction identifying information is provided by the recipient. (see Claim 17 of PG Pub. '856);

- comparing the transaction identifying information with transaction data on the host computer system. (see Claim 17 of PG Pub. '856);
- providing a confirmation code (account code) and/or identification code, to be issued to the recipient, if the transaction identifying information matches the transaction data stored on the host computer system (see Claim 22 and Claim 23 of PG Pub. '856);
- storing the confirmation code (account code) and/or identification code on the host computer system. (see Claim 22 and Claim 23 of PG Pub. '856);
- receiving at the host computer system input corresponding to the confirmation code and/or identification code from a dispensing terminal in communication with the host computer system. (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856);
- comparing the input to the confirmation code and/or identification code stored on the host computer system (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856); and
- allowing funds, corresponding to at least a portion of the desired amount of money, to be dispensed by the dispensing terminal if the input matches the confirmation code and/or identification code stored on the host computer system. (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856).

Regarding Claims 2 – 4 and 11 – 13, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims a confirmation code (stored account code) and/or identification code (stored identification code). (See Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856). While PG Pub. '856 does not explicitly state that the confirmation code and/or the identification code includes a number, letter or symbol, it is well-known in the art that security codes, such as a PIN, an identification number and a computer password, can be composed of numbers, letters or symbols.

Regarding Claim 23, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims loading payout funds corresponding to at least a portion of the desired amount of money in a payout account maintained on the host computer system, and allowing the payout account to go negative by an amount to cover a transaction fee associated with use of the dispensing terminal. (see Claim 54 of PG Pub. '856)

Regarding Claim 24, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims loading payout funds corresponding to at least a portion of the desired amount of money in a payout account maintained on the host computer system, receiving at the host computer system a debit request from the dispensing terminal, automatically determining by the host computer system a transaction fee associated with use of the dispensing terminal in response to receiving the debit request, and then loading an additional amount in the payout account to cover the transaction fee. (see Claims 12 – 13 of PG Pub. '856).

Regarding Claim 25, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims the step of automatically determining the transaction fee includes assuming an even, whole dollar first portion of the debit request corresponds to a desired withdrawal amount for the recipient, and attributing a second portion of the debit request to the transaction fee. (see Claim 13 of PG Pub. '856).

Regarding Claim 26, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims loading payout funds corresponding to at least a portion of the desired amount of money in a payout account maintained on the host computer system, and allowing the dispensing terminal to debit the payout account to cover a transaction fee associated with use of the dispensing terminal. (see Claim 10 of PG Pub. '856).

Regarding Claim 27, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims the allowing step includes allowing funds, corresponding to a first portion of the desired amount of money, to be dispensed by the dispensing terminal if the input matches the confirmation code stored on the host computer system, and wherein the method further comprises receiving at the host computer system additional input corresponding to the confirmation code from an additional dispensing terminal in communication with the host computer system, comparing the additional input to the confirmation code stored on the host computer system, and allowing additional funds, corresponding to a second portion of the desired amount of money, to be dispensed by the additional dispensing terminal if

the additional input matches the confirmation code stored on the host computer system.
(see Claim 4 and 15 of PG Pub. '856).

Regarding Claims 29, 36 and 38, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims the step of receiving transaction identifying information includes receiving the transaction identifying information at the host computer system from an electronic terminal (a first terminal) that is different than the dispensing terminal (a second terminal). (see Claim 30 of PG Pub. '856).

Regarding Claims 33 and 34, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims the allowing/authorizing step comprises allowing/authorizing the funds to be dispensed by the dispensing terminal to the recipient. (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 21 – 22, 30 – 32 and 35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 4, 10, 12 – 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 30, 40 and 54 of copending Application No. 09/975,171, herein referred to as PG Pub. '856, in view of Walker (US Patent 5,650,604).

Regarding Claim 21 – 22 and 31, PG Pub. '856 claims:

Art Unit: 3693

- a method further comprising receiving at the host computer an identification code provided by the recipient. (see Claim 17 of PG Pub. '856).

PG Pub. '856 does not claim:

- a method wherein the transaction identifying information includes a first code provided by the sender to the recipient;
- a method further comprising generating the confirmation code by the host computer system based on the identification code, wherein the identification code is different than the first code; or
- a method wherein the confirmation code is not provided by or to the sender during the money transfer receive transaction.

Walker discloses:

- a method wherein the transaction identifying information includes a first code provided by the sender to the recipient. ("Transferor provides transferee with transferor identification number and other transaction information." – see 1220, figure 12A);
- a method further comprising receiving at the host computer system an identification code (transferor identification number) provided by the recipient, and generating the confirmation code (confirmation) by the host computer system based on the identification code, wherein the identification code is different than the first code. ("Transferor provides transferee with transferor identification number and other transaction

information.” – see 1220, figure 12A). (“Central controller sends a confirmation to the transferee.” – see 1275, figure 12B). It would be assumed that the confirmation code would be a different code than the identification code as there would be no value in repeating back to the recipient the same inputted code; and

- a method wherein the confirmation code (confirmation) is not provided by or to the sender during the money transfer receive transaction. (“Central controller sends a confirmation to the transferee.” – see 1275, figure 12B).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified PG Pub. ‘856 by having the sender provide the recipient with the identification code that causes the host computer system to generate a confirmation code, as was done by Walker, as an additional security layer on the fund transfer process.

Regarding Claim 30 and 32, PG Pub. ‘856 claims a dispensing terminal. (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. ‘856).

PG Pub. ‘856 does not claim that:

- the dispensing terminal is an unattended teller machine.

Walker discloses that:

- the dispensing terminal is an unattended automatic teller machine. (“This credit can be used to offset other incurred charges on transferee’s account or can be withdrawn from the account as cash at an Automated Teller Machine (ATM).” – see paragraph 0057).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified PG Pub. '856 by allowing the recipient to receive the dispensed funds at an Automated Teller Machine, as was done by Walker, to provide the recipient a method to easily obtain the transferred funds.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 5, 14 and 28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 4, 10, 12 – 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 30, 40 and 54 of copending Application No. 09/975,171, herein referred to as PG Pub. '856, in view of Shore (US PG Pub. 2003/0149662).

Regarding Claim 5 and 14, PG Pub. '856 does not claim a method of wherein:

- the confirmation code and/or identification code includes an image.

Shore discloses a method of wherein:

- the confirmation code and/or identification code includes an image. ("The image verification would be an additional security measure that would work in conjunction with all the others." – see paragraph 0123).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified PG Pub. '856, by incorporating a variety of formats for the confirmation code and/or identification code, as was done by Shore, to ensure that the confirmation code and/or identification code could be communicated in a versatile manner and for allowing further security measures for the funds transfer process.

Regarding Claim 28, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims:

- storing the identification code on the host computer system. (see Claim 22 and Claim 23 of PG Pub. '856);
- receiving at the host computer system input corresponding to the confirmation code and/or identification code from a dispensing terminal in communication with the host computer system. (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856);
- comparing the additional input to the identification code stored on the host computer system (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856); and
- allowing funds, corresponding to at least a portion of the desired amount of money, to be dispensed by the dispensing terminal if the input matches the identification code stored on the host computer system. (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856).

PG Pub. '856 does not claim:

- receiving at the host computer an identification code from an electronic terminal that is different from the dispensing terminal, the identification code being an anatomical image of the recipient.

Shore discloses:

- receiving at the host computer an identification code from an electronic terminal that is different from the dispensing terminal, the identification code being an anatomical image (fingerprint and/or other biometric data)

of the recipient. ("The image verification would be an additional security measure that would work in conjunction with all the others." – see paragraph 0123). ("In the exemplary embodiment, a user ID or and PIN and/or fingerprint (the phrase "fingerprint" is meant herein to include the "print" or other image of any finger, including a thumb) and/or other biometric data, would be required to access or transmit any data from the PDA device using the PDA software." – see paragraph 0018).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified PG Pub. '856, by incorporating a variety of formats for the identification code, as was done by Shore, to ensure that identification code could be communicated in a versatile manner and allowing for further security measures for the funds transfer process. While neither Seifert nor Shore explicitly state that anatomical image is entered via a first terminal, it is well-known in the art that anatomical image would need to be entered into the system prior to the recipient's use of the dispensing terminal.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 6 – 9 and 37 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 4, 10, 12 – 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 30, 40 and 54 of copending Application No. 09/975,171, herein referred to as PG Pub. '856, in view of Amann (US PG Pub 2002/0062285).

Regarding Claim 6 – 9, PG Pub. '856 does not claim:

- a method wherein the step of providing a confirmation code includes providing, by the host computer system, the confirmation code to a receive-transaction initiating device in communication with the host computer system;
- a method wherein the receive-transaction device is a personal computer;
- a method wherein the receive-transaction initiating device is a telephone;
or
- a method wherein the step of providing a confirmation code includes providing, by a telephone operator, the confirmation code to the recipient.

Amann discloses:

- a method wherein the step of providing a confirmation code (PIN) includes providing, by the host computer system, the confirmation code to a receive-transaction initiating device in communication with the host computer system (P2P server). ("The P2P server is capable of transmitting the response to a payee computing device, which optionally includes the PIN code required to access the payment." – see paragraph 0014);
- a method wherein the receive-transaction device is a personal computer (payee computing device). ("The P2P server is capable of transmitting the response to a payee computing device, which optionally includes the PIN code required to access the payment." – see paragraph 0014);

- a method wherein the receive-transaction initiating device is a telephone.
("Alternatively, the PIN code is transmitted to the payor computing device and communicated to the payee via any transmission method known to those skilled in the art, for example, via telephone or email." – see paragraph 0014); and
- a method of wherein the step of providing a confirmation code includes providing, by a telephone operator, the confirmation code to the recipient.
(" Alternatively, the PIN code is transmitted to the payor computing device and communicated to the payee via any transmission method known to those skilled in the art, for example, via telephone or email." – see paragraph 0014).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified PG Pub. '856, by incorporating the ability to communicate the confirmation code and/or identification code to the recipient through a personal computer or through the telephone, as was done by Amann, to enhance ease of communication of the confirmation code and/or identification code to recipient.

Regarding Claim 37, PG Pub. '856 does not claim a method wherein:

- the identification number and the confirmation code are not provided by or to the sender during the money transfer receive transaction.

Amann discloses a method wherein:

- the identification number (PIN) and the confirmation code (notification) are not provided by or to the sender during the money transfer receive

transaction. ("The P2P system delivers the notification and PIN code to the payee device, instructing the payee as to the location of the ATM instructed to dispense the currency for payment." – see paragraph 0041).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified PG Pub. '856, by incorporating the ability to communicate the confirmation code and/or identification code to the recipient and not to the sender, as was done by Amann, to enhance security on the money transfer process.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 15 - 18 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 4, 10, 12 – 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 30, 40 and 54 of copending Application No. 09/975,171, herein referred to as PG Pub. '856, in view of Risafi (US Patent 6,473,500).

Regarding Claim 15, PG Pub. '856 claims:

- storing the identification code on the host computer system; (see Claim 22 and Claim 23 of PG Pub. '856);
- receiving at the host computer system input corresponding to the confirmation code and/or identification code from a dispensing terminal in communication with the host computer system. (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856);

- comparing the input to the confirmation code and/or identification code stored on the host computer system (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856); and
- allowing funds, corresponding to at least a portion of the desired amount of money, to be dispensed by the dispensing terminal if the input matches the confirmation code and/or identification code stored on the host computer system. (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856).

PG Pub. '856 does not claim:

- receiving an identification code established by the recipient.

Risafi discloses a method further comprising:

- receiving an identification code (PIN) established by the recipient. ("The user selects a PIN of his or her choice upon inserting the purchased card into an terminal or by accessing another designated device, such as a interactive voice response unit ("IVRU")." – see col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified PG Pub. '856, by incorporating the ability for the recipient to select his own identification code, as was done by Risafi, to allow the identification code to be set to a code more easily remembered by the recipient.

Regarding Claims 16 – 18, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because PG Pub. '856 claims a confirmation code (stored account code) and/or identification code (stored identification code). (see Claim 40 of PG Pub. '856). While PG Pub. '856 does not explicitly state that the

Art Unit: 3693

confirmation code and/or the identification code includes a number, letter or symbol, it is well-known in the art that security codes, such as a PIN, an identification number and a computer password, can be composed of numbers, letters or symbols.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim 19 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 4, 10, 12 – 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 30, 40 and 54 of copending Application No. 09/975,171, herein referred to as PG Pub. '856, in view of Risafi and Shore.

Regarding Claim 19, PG Pub. '856 does not claim a method of wherein:

- the confirmation code and/or identification code includes an image.

Shore discloses a method of wherein:

- the confirmation code and/or identification code includes an image. ("The image verification would be an additional security measure that would work in conjunction with all the others." – see paragraph 0123).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified PG Pub. '856 and Risafi, by incorporating a variety of formats for the confirmation code and/or identification code, as was done by Shore, to ensure that the confirmation code and/or identification code could be communicated in a versatile manner and allowing further security for the funds transfer process.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Response to Arguments

As discussed with applicant's attorney of record in previous communications, examiner agrees with applicant's assertions that the application indicates allowable subject matter. Examiner awaits filing of a terminal disclaimer to eliminate the outstanding double-patenting rejections, after which time examiner will initiate allowance proceedings.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M. Borlinghaus whose telephone number is (571) 272-6924. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached at (571) 272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 3693

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James A. Kramer/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3693

/Jason M Borlinghaus/

Examiner, Art Unit 3693

March 20, 2008

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

10/037,827

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

SEIFERT ET AL.

Examiner

JASON M. BORLINGHAUS

Art Unit

3693